



FILED

MAY 19 2010

STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE
SAN FRANCISCO

STATE BAR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
HEARING DEPARTMENT – SAN FRANCISCO

In the Matter of)	Case No.: 97-Q-16741
)	
CHARLES TAUB)	ORDER RE COSTS
)	
Petitioner for Relief from Costs.)	
_____)	

On April 16, 2010, petitioner **Charles Taub** filed a brief entitled Motion/Petition in Support of Payment Plan (“Motion for Payments”). In his Motion for Payments, petitioner sought a payment plan and an extension of time to comply with an order of payment of disciplinary costs and Client Security Fund reimbursements relating to State Bar Court Case Nos. 90-O-11114, 96-F-01781, 97-Q-16741, 99-F-10566, 99-F-11498, and 00-F-14106. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 282, *et seq.*) Petitioner’s motion was based on financial hardship.

On May 11, 2010, Deputy Trial Counsel Mark Hartman of the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar of California (“State Bar”) filed a response. The State Bar does not oppose petitioner’s request for an extension of time to pay his disciplinary costs; however the State Bar asserts that the court lacks jurisdiction over the monies petitioner currently owes the Client Security Fund because, among other things, a judgment has yet to be entered.¹

¹ As of February 25, 2010, petitioner owed \$2,483.00 in disciplinary costs, and \$367,069.71 to the Client Security Fund.

After thorough consideration of the parties' pleadings, the court issues the following orders:

1. Petitioner's motion for extension of time to comply with the order to pay disciplinary costs is **GRANTED**. The court orders that petitioner's time to pay the disciplinary costs relating to case numbers 90-O-11114 and 97-Q-16741 be extended by one year from the date of filing of the present order; and

2. Petitioner's motion for an extension of time to comply with an order of payment of Client Security Fund reimbursements is **DENIED**, for lack of jurisdiction. (See Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 285(a).)

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 18, 2010



LUCY ARMENDARIZ
Judge of the State Bar Court

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

[Rule 62(b), Rules Proc.; Code Civ. Proc., § 1013a(4)]

I am a Case Administrator of the State Bar Court of California. I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to the within proceeding. Pursuant to standard court practice, in the City and County of San Francisco, on May 19, 2010, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

ORDER RE COSTS

in a sealed envelope for collection and mailing on that date as follows:

by first-class mail, with postage thereon fully prepaid, through the United States Postal Service at San Francisco, California, addressed as follows:

**CHARLES TAUB
168 GRATTAN STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94117**

by certified mail, No. , with return receipt requested, through the United States Postal Service at , California, addressed as follows:

by overnight mail at , California, addressed as follows:

by fax transmission, at fax number . No error was reported by the fax machine that I used.

By personal service by leaving the documents in a sealed envelope or package clearly labeled to identify the attorney being served with a receptionist or a person having charge of the attorney's office, addressed as follows:

by interoffice mail through a facility regularly maintained by the State Bar of California addressed as follows:

MARK HARTMAN, Enforcement, San Francisco

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on May 19, 2010.



Bernadette C.O. Molina
Case Administrator
State Bar Court